arXiv:hep-ph/9206263v2 21 Jul 1992

June 22, 1992 LBL-32491 (Revised)

Magnetic Monopoles As a New Solution to Strong CP Problem *

Huazhong Zhang

Theoretical Physics Group

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

MS 50A-3115, 1 Cyclotron Road

Berkeley, California 94720

Abstract

A non-perturbative solution to strong CP problem is proposed. It is shown that the gauge orbit space with gauge potentials and gauge tranformations restricted on the space boundary in non-abelian gauge theories with a θ term has a magnetic monopole structure if there is a magnetic monopole in the ordinary space. The Dirac's quantization condition in the corresponding quantum theories ensures that the vacuum angle θ in the gauge theories must be quantized. The quantization rule is derived as $\theta = 2\pi/n$ $(n \neq 0)$ with n being the topological charge of the magnetic monopole. Therefore, we conclude that the strong CP problem is automatically solved non-perturbatively with the existence of a magnetic monopole of charge ± 1 with $\theta = \pm 2\pi$. This is also true when the total magnetic charge of monopoles are very large ($|n| \geq 10^9 2\pi$) if it is consistent with the abundance of magnetic monopoles. This implies that the fact that the strong CP violation can be only so small or vanishing may be a signal for the existence of magnetic monopoles.

*This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

Since the discovery of Yang-Mills theories[1], the non-perturbative effects of gauge theories have played one of the most important roles in particle physics. It is known that, in non-abelian gauge theories a Pontryagin or θ term,

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta = \frac{\theta}{32\pi^2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\lambda\sigma}, \tag{1}$$

can be added to the Lagrangian density of the system due to instanton[2] effects in gauge theories. The θ term can induce CP violations. An interesting fact is that the θ angle in QCD can be only very small ($\theta \leq 10^{-9}$) or vanishing[3]. Where in our discussions of QCD, θ is used to denote $\theta + arg(detM)$ effectively with M being the quark mass matrix, when the effects of electroweak interactions are included. One of the most interesting understanding of the strong CP problem has been the assumption of an additional Peccei-Quinn $U(1)_{PQ}$ symmetry[4], but the observation has not given[3] evidence for the axions[5] needed in this approach. Thus the other possible solutions to this problem are of fundamental interest.

In this paper, we will extend the method of Wu and Zee[6] for the discussions of the effects of the Pontryagin term in pure Yang-Mills theories in the gauge orbit spaces in the Schrodinger formulation. This formalism has also been used with different methods to derive the mass parameter quantization in three-dimensional Yang-Mills theory with Chern-Simons term[6−7]. Wu and Zee showed[6] that the Pontryagin term induces an abelian background field or an abelian structure in the gauge configuration space of the Yang-Mills theory. In our discussions, we will consider the case with the existence of a magnetic monopole. We will show that magnetic monopoles[8−9] in space will induce an abelian gauge field with non-vanishing field strength in gauge configuration space, and magnetic flux through a two-dimensional sphere in the induced gauge orbit space is non-vanishing. Then, Dirac condition[8−9] in the corresponding quantum theories leads to the result that the relevant vacuum angle θ must be quantized as $\theta = 2\pi/n$ with n being the topological charge of the monopole

to be generally defined. Therefore, the strong CP problem can be solved with the existence of magnetic monopoles. To the knowledge of the author, such an interesting result has never been given before in the literature.

We will now consider the Yang-Mills theory with the existence of a magnetic monopole at the origin. As we will see that an interesting feature in our derivation is that we will use the Dirac quantization condition both in the ordinary space and restricted gauge orbit space to be defined. The Lagrangian of the system is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d^4x \{ -\frac{1}{4} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{\theta}{32\pi^2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^{a\lambda\sigma} \}. \tag{2}$$

We will use the Schrodinger formulation and the Weyl gauge $A^0 = 0$. The conjugate momentum corresponding to A^a_i is given by

$$\pi^a_i = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \dot{A}^a_i} = \dot{A}^a_i + \frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \epsilon_{ijk} F^a_{jk}. \tag{3}$$

In the Schrodinger formulation, the system is similar to the quantum system of a particle with the coordinate q_i moving in a gauge field $A_i(q)$ with the correspondence[6–7]

$$q_i(t) \rightarrow A^a_i(\mathbf{x}, t), \tag{4}$$

$$A_i(q) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^a_i(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})), \tag{5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^a_i(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{\theta}{8\pi^2} \epsilon_{ijk} F^a_{jk}. \tag{6}$$

Thus there is a gauge structure with gauge potential $\mathcal{A}$ in this formalism within a gauge theory with the θ term included. Note that in our discussion with the presence of a magnetic monopole, the gauge potential $\mathbf{A}$ outside the monopole generally need to be understood as well defined in each local coordinate region.

In the overlapping regions, the separate gauge potentials can only differ by a well-defined gauge transformation[9]. In fact, single-valuedness of the gauge function corresponds to the Dirac quantization condition[9]. For a given r, we can choose two extended semi-spheres around the monopole, with $\theta \in [\pi/2-\delta, \pi/2+\delta](0 < \delta < \pi/2)$ in the overlapping region, where the θ denotes the θ angle in the spherical polar coordinates. For convenience, we will use differential forms[10] in our discussions, where $A = A_i dx^i, F = \frac{1}{2}F_{jk}dx^j dx^k$, with $F = dA + A^2$ locally. For our purpose to discuss about the effects of the abelian gauge structure on the quantization of the vacuum angle, we will now briefly clarify the relevant topological results needed, then we will realize the topological results explicitly.

With the constraint of Gauss' law, the quantum theory in this formalism is described in the gauge orbit space $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$ which is a quotient space of the gauge configuration space $\mathcal{U}$ with gauge potentials connected by gauge transformations in each local coordinate region regarded as equivalent. Where $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the space of continuous gauge transformations, and each gauge potential as an element in $\mathcal{U}$ may be defined up to a gauge transformation in the overlapping regions. Now consider the following exact homotopy sequence[11]:

$$\Pi_N(\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{P_*} \Pi_N(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\Delta_*} \Pi_{N-1}(\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{i_*} \Pi_{N-1}(\mathcal{U}) \ (N \geq 1). \tag{7}$$

Note that homotopy theory has also been used to study the global gauge anomalies [12−19], especially by using extensively the exact homotopy sequences and in terms of James numbers of Stiefel manifolds14 − 19. One can easily see that $\mathcal{U}$ is topologically trivial, thus $\Pi_N(\mathcal{U}) = 0$ for any N. Since the interpolation between any two gauge potentials A_1 and A_2

$$A_t = tA_1 + (1-t)A_2 \tag{8}$$

for any real t is in $\mathcal{U}$ (Theorem 7 in Ref.9, and Ref.6). since A_t is transformed as a gauge potential in each local coordinate region, and in an overlapping

region, both A_1 and A_2 are gauge potentials may be defined up to a gauge transformation, then A_t is a gauge potential which may be defined up to a gauge transformation, namely, $A_t \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus, we have

$$0 \xrightarrow{P_*} \Pi_N(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\Delta_*} \Pi_{N-1}(\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{i_*} 0 \ (N \geq 1). \tag{9}$$

This implies that

$$\Pi_N(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \cong \Pi_{N-1}(\mathcal{G}) \ (N \geq 1). \tag{10}$$

As we will show that in the presence of a magnetic monopole, the topological properties of the system are drastically different. This will give important consequences in the quantum theory. Actually, it is interesting to note more generally that the topological results in Eq.(9-10) are true if $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are the corresponding induced spaces with A and g restricted to certain region of the ordinary space, especially the 2-sphere S^2 as the space boundary since the restricted gauge configuration space $\mathcal{U}$ is topologically trivial. This is in fact the the relevant case in our discussion, since only the integrals on the space boundary S^2 are relevant in the quantization equation as we will see. We will call the induced spaces of $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$ when A and g are restricted on the space boundary S^2 as restricted gauge configuration space, restricted gauge orbit space and restricted gauge transformation space respectively, and restricted spaces collectively. Now for the restricted spaces, the main topological result we will use is given by

$$\Pi_2(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \cong \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}), \tag{11}$$

The condition $\Pi_2(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \neq 0$ corresponds to the existence of a magnetic monopole in the restricted gauge orbit space. In the usual unrestricted case based on the whole compactified space M as that for pure Yang-Mills theory, there can not be monopole structure constructed. We will first show that in this case $\mathcal{F} \neq 0$, and then demonstrate explicitly that the magnetic flux $\int_{S^2} \hat{\mathcal{F}} \neq 0$ can be

nonvanishing in the restricted gauge orbit space, where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ denotes the projection of $\mathcal{F}$ into the restricted gauge orbit space.

Denote the differentiation with respect to space variable $\mathbf{x}$ by d, and the differentiation with respect to parameters $\{t_i \mid i = 1, 2...\}$ which $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})$ may depend on in the gauge configuration space by δ, and assume $d\delta + \delta d$=0. Then, similar to $A = A_\mu dx^\mu$ with μ replaced by a, i, $\mathbf{x}$, $A = A_i^a L^a dx^i, F = \frac{1}{2} F_{jk}^a L^a dx^j dx^k$ and $tr(L^a L^b) = -\frac{1}{2}\delta^{ab}$ for a basis $\{L^a \mid a = 1, 2, ..., rank(G)\}$ of the Lie algebra of the gauge group G, the gauge potential in the gauge configuration space is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^3x \mathcal{A}_i^a(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}))\delta A_i^a(\mathbf{x}). \tag{12}$$

Using Eq.(6), this gives

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\theta}{8\pi^2}\int d^3x \epsilon_{ijk} F_{jk}^a(\mathbf{x})\delta A_i^a(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_M tr(\delta A F), \tag{13}$$

with M being the space manifold. With $\delta F = -D_A(\delta A) = -\{d(\delta A) + A\delta A - \delta A A\}$, we have topologically

$$\mathcal{F} = \delta\mathcal{A} = \frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_M tr[\delta A D_A(\delta A)] = \frac{\theta}{4\pi^2}\int_M dtr(\delta A \delta A) = \frac{\theta}{4\pi^2}\int_{\partial M} tr(\delta A \delta A). \tag{14}$$

Usually, one may assume $A \to 0$ faster than 1/r as $\mathbf{x} \to \mathbf{0}$, then[6] this would give $\mathcal{F} = 0$. However, this is not the case in the presence of a magnetic monopole. Asymptotically, a monopole may generally give a field strength of the form[8−9,20]

$$F_{ij} = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2}\epsilon_{ijk}(\hat{\mathbf{r}})_k G(\hat{\mathbf{r}}), \tag{15}$$

with $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ being the unit vector for $\mathbf{r}$, and this gives $A \to O(1/r)$ as $\mathbf{x} \to \mathbf{0}$. Thus, one can see easily that a magnetic monopole can give a nonvanishing field strength $\mathcal{F}$ in the gauge configuration space. To evaluate the $\mathcal{F}$, one needs to specify the space boundary ∂M in the presence of a magnetic monopole. we now consider the case that the magnetic monopole does not generate a singularity

in the space. In fact, this is so when monopoles appear as a smooth solution of a spontaneously broken gauge theory similar to 't Hooft Polyakov monopole[8]. For example, it is known that[21] there are monopole solutions in the minimal SU(5) model. Then, the space boundary may be regarded as a large 2-sphere S^2 at spatial infinity. For our purpose, we actually only need to evaluate the projection of $\mathcal{F}$ into the gauge orbit space.

In the gauge orbit space, a gauge potential can be written in the form of

$$A = g^{-1}ag + g^{-1}dg, \tag{16}$$

for an element a $\in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$ and a gauge function $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Then the projection of a form into the gauge orbit space contains only terms proportional to $(\delta a)^n$ for integers n. We can now write

$$\delta A = g^{-1}[\delta a - D_a(\delta g g^{-1})]g. \tag{17}$$

Then we obtain

$$\mathcal{A} = -\frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_M tr(f\delta a) + \frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_M tr[fD_a(\delta g g^{-1})], \tag{18}$$

where $f = da + a^2$. With some calculations, this can be simplified as

$$\mathcal{A} = \hat{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_{S^2} tr[f\delta g g^{-1}], \tag{19}$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}} = -\frac{\theta}{2\pi^2}\int_M tr(f\delta a), \tag{20}$$

is the projection of $\mathcal{A}$ into the gauge orbit space. Similarly, we have

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{\theta}{4\pi^2}\int_{S^2} tr\{[\delta a - D_a(\delta g g^{-1})][\delta a - D_a(\delta g g^{-1})]\} \tag{21}$$

or

$$\mathcal{F} = \hat{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\theta}{4\pi^2}\int_{S^2} tr\{\delta a D_a(\delta g g^{-1}) + D_a(\delta g g^{-1})\delta a - D_a(\delta g g^{-1})D_a(\delta g g^{-1})\}, \tag{22}$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{\theta}{4\pi^2}\int_{S^2} tr(\delta a \delta a). \tag{23}$$

Now all our discussions will be based on the restricted spaces. To see that the flux of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ through a closed surface in the restricted gauge orbit space $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$ can be nonzero, we will construct a 2-sphere in it. Consider an element $a \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$, and a loop in $\mathcal{G}$. The set of all the gauge potentials obtained by all the gauge transformations on a with gauge functions on the loop then forms a loop C^1 in the gauge configurations space $\mathcal{U}$. Obviously, the a is the projection of the loop C^1 into $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$. Now since $\Pi_1(\mathcal{U}) = 0$ is trivial, the loop C^1 can be continuously extented to a two-dimensional disc D^2 in the $\mathcal{U}$ with $\partial D^2 = C^1$, then obviously, the projection of the D^2 into the gauge orbit space is topologically a 2-sphere $S^2 \subset \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}$. With the Stokes' theorem in the gauge configuration space, We now have

$$\int_{D^2} \mathcal{F} = \int_{D^2} \delta\mathcal{A} = \int_{C^1} \mathcal{A}. \tag{24}$$

Using Eqs.(19) and (24) with $\delta a = 0$ on C^1, this gives

$$\int_{C^1} \mathcal{A} = \frac{\theta}{2\pi^2} tr \int_{S^2}\int_{C^1} [f\delta g g^{-1}]. \tag{25}$$

Thus, the projection of the Eq.(26) to the gauge orbit space gives

$$\int_{S^2} \hat{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{\theta}{2\pi^2} tr \int_{S^2} \{f \int_{C^1} \delta g g^{-1}\}, \tag{26}$$

where note that in the two S^2 are in the gauge orbit space and the ordinary space respectively. We have also obtained this by verifying that

$$\int_{D^2} tr \int_{S^2} tr\{\delta a D_a(\delta g g^{-1}) + D_a(\delta g g^{-1})\delta a - D_a(\delta g g^{-1}) D_a(\delta g g^{-1})\} = 0, \tag{27}$$

or the projection of $\int_{D^2} \mathcal{F}$ gives $\int_{S^2} \hat{\mathcal{F}}$.

In quantum theory, Eq.(26) corresponds to the topological result $\Pi_2(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \cong \Pi_1(\mathcal{G})$ on the restricted spaces. The discussion about the Hamiltonian equation

in the schrodinger formulation will be similar to that in Refs.6 and 7 including the discussions for the three-dimensional Yang-Mills theories with a Chern-Simons term. We only need the Dirac quantization condition here for our purpose. In the gauge orbit space, the Dirac quantization condition gives

$$\int_{S^2} \hat{\mathcal{F}} = 2\pi k, \tag{28}$$

with k being integers. Now let f be the field strength 2-form for the magnetic monopole. The quantization condition is now given by[20]

$$exp\{\int_{S^2} f\} = exp\{G_0\} = exp\{4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta^i H_i\} \in Z. \tag{29}$$

Where G_0 is the magnetic charge up to a conjugate transformation by a group element, H_i (i=1, 2,...,r=rank(G)) form a basis for the Cartan subalgebra of the gauge group with simple roots α_i (i=1,2,...,r). We need non-zero topological value to obtain quantization condition for θ. One way to obtain non-zero value for Eq.(26) is to consider g(t) in the following U(1) subgroup on the C^1

$$g(t) = exp\{4\pi m t \sum_{i,j} \frac{(\alpha_i)^j H_j}{< \alpha_i, \alpha_i >}\}, \tag{30}$$

with m being integers and $t \in [0, 1]$. In fact, m should be identical to k according to our topological result $\Pi_2(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{G}) \cong \Pi_1(\mathcal{G})$. The k and m are the topological numbers on each side. Thus, we obtain

$$\theta = \frac{2\pi}{n} \ (n \neq 0). \tag{31}$$

Where we define generally the topological charge of the magnetic monopole as

$$n = -2 < \delta, \beta >= -2 \sum_i < \lambda_i, \beta >, \tag{32}$$

which must be an integer[20]. Where

$$\delta = \sum_i \frac{2\alpha_i}{< \alpha_i, \alpha_i >} = \sum_i \lambda_i, \tag{33}$$

with the λ_i being the fundamental weights of the Lie algebra, the minus sign is due to our normalization convention for Lie algebra generators.

Therefore, we conclude that in the presence of magnetic monopoles with topological charge ± 1, the vacuum angle of non-abelian gauge theories must be $\pm 2\pi$, the existence of such magnetic monopoles gives a solution to the strong CP problem. But CP cannot be exactly conserved in this case since $\theta = \pm 2\pi$ correspond to two different physical sysytems. The existence of many monopoles can ensure $\theta \to 0$, and the strong CP problem may also be solved. In this possible solution to the strong CP problem with $\theta \leq 10^{-9}$, the total magnetic charges present are $|n| \geq 2\pi 10^9$. This may possiblely be within the abundance allowed by the ratio of monopoles to the entropy[22], but with the possible existence of both monopoles and anti-monopoles, the total number of magnetic monopoles may be larger than the total magnetic charges. Generally, one needs to ensure that the total number is consistent with the experimental results on the abundance of monopoles. The $n = \pm 2$ may also possibilely solve CP if it is consistent with the experimental observation.

In the above discussions, we consider the case that magnetic monopole generates no singularity in the space. If we consider the magnetic monopole as a singularity, then with the space outside the monopole the two opposite boundary contributions are cancelled in the relevant integrations since each inward small sphere arround the monopole for removing the singularity effectively gives a contribution of the opposite topological charge. Therefore, only non-singular magnetic monopoles may provide the solution to the strong CP problem.

Moreover, note that our conclusions are also true if we add an additional θ term in QED with the θ angle the same as the effective θ in QCD if there exist Dirac monopoles as color singlets, or a non-abelian monopoles with magnetic charges both in the color SU(3) and electromagnetic U(1). Then a explana-

tion of such a QED θ term is needed. The effect of a term proportional to $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\lambda\sigma}$ in the presence of magnetic charges was first considered[23] relevant to chiral symmetry. The effect of a similar U(1) θ term was discussed for the purpose of considering the induced electric charges[24] as quantum excitations of dyons associated with the 't Hooft Polyakov monopole and generalized magnetic monopoles[20,24]. For our purpose, We expect that if a QED θ term is included, it may possiblely be an indication of the unification. A θ term needs to be included in the unification gauge theory for $\Pi_3(G) = Z$ for the unification group G, magnetic monopoles with charges involving the QED U(1) symmetry are generated through the spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking. Generally, such an induced θ term in QED may not be discarded in the presence of magnetic monopoles.

As a remark, our quantization rule can also be obtained by using constraints of Gauss' law. This will be given elsewhere.

I thank Y. S. Wu and A. Zee for valuable discussions.

References

[1] C. N. Yang and R. L. Mills, Phys. Rev. 96, 191 (1954).

[2] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwarz and Yu. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. 59B, 85 (1975); R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 172 (1976); C. Callan, R. Dashen and D. Gross, Phys. Lett. 63B, 334 (1976); G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 8 (1976) and Phys. Rev. D14, 334(1976).

[3] R. Peccei, in "CP Violations" (ed. C. Jarlskog, World Scientific , Singapore, 1989).

[4] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 1440 (1977); Phys. Rev. D16, 1791 (1977).

[5] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40, 223 (1978); F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40, 271 (1978).

[6] Y. S. Wu and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. B258, 157 (1985).

[7] R. Jackiw, in "Relativity, Groups and Topology II", (Les Houches 1983, ed. B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora, Noth-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984).

[8] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. A133, 60 (1931); Phys. Rev. 74, 817 (1948); 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. 79, 276 (1974); A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. 20, 194 (1974). For a review, see S. Coleman, in "The Unity of the Fundamental Interactions" and references theirin.

[9] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. D12, 3845 (1975).

[10] For a brief review, see for example, B. Zumino, in "Relativity, Groups and Topology II", (Les Houches 1983, ed. B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora, Noth-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984)

[11] See for example, S. T. Hu, "Homotopy Theory", (Academic Press, New York, 1956); N. Steenrod, "The topology of Fiber Bundles", (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ 1951).

[12] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B117, 324 (1982).

[13] S. Elitzur and V. P. Nair, Nucl. Phys. B243, 205 (1984).

[14] S. Okubo, H. Zhang, Y. Tosa, and R. E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. D37, 1655 (1988).

[15] H. Zhang, S. Okubo, and Y. Tosa, Phys. Rev. D37, 2946 (1988).

[16] H. Zhang and S. Okubo, Phys. Rev. D38, 1800 (1988).

[17] S. Okubo and H. Zhang, in "Perspectives on Particle Physics (ed. S. Matsuda, T. Muta, and R. Sakaki, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).

[18] A. T. Lundell and Y. Tosa, J. Math. Phys. 29, 1795 (1988).

[19] S. Okubo and Y. Tosa, Phys. Rev. D40, 1925 (1989).

[20] See P. Goddard and D. Olive, Rep. Prog. Phys. 41, 1375 (1978); P. Goddard, J. Nuyts, D. Olive, Nucl. Phys. B125, 1 (1977).

[21] C. Dokos and T. Tomaras, Phys. Rev. D21, 2940 (1980).

[22] J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43 1365 (1979); G. Giacomelli, in "Monopoles in Quantum Field Theory", (World Scientific, Singapore, 1981).

[23] H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. D13, 343(1976); W. Marciano and H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. D14, 531(1976).

[24] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B86, 283 (1979); E. Tomboulis and G. Woo , Nucl. Phys. B107, 221 (1976); H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D36, 1868 (1987).